

we did cap off, Scotty and Senator Wehrbein, at 7.2. We adjusted the cap down to what the appropriation request was for the second year. Secondly, if we're concerned about caps, we really think, well, don't vote for this because it's got a cap on it and you know what is going to happen, somebody is going to amend that cap later on and you're probably going to blow a lot of money from your state. I just supported the Commonwealth thing, it has a cap on it. We might not fund it the first year, the second year, the third year, the fourth year, but I didn't worry about that cap. I think the integrity of this body committing future legislators to a sum of money is pretty sacred stuff, and it's fun and games time if we try to fool with the caps. So, if one cap indicates the possibility of fun and games, probably I guess the other cap should as well. I don't think they do. I don't think that kind of thing will happen at all. I'd just like to say that there probably was another way to handle this, but since I worked for so long, a couple of years on this thing, it seems to me that the purpose served by this legislation, the people served by this legislation, the clarification not only in the statutes, but as it applies to our jurisdictions of government,...

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.

SENATOR LYNCH: ...in identifying the responsibilities at all levels is important. And so even though I could suggest there may be another way to resolve this, I would simply do my duty and suggest we support this amendment. And, if no other lights are on, Mr. Chairman, that will be my closing.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you, but there are more lights on. Senator Wesely.

SENATOR WESELY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, members. I'd like to try and help clarify, I guess, the situation as best I can. As I understand the amendment, it is an attempt to decrease the amount of funding in this bill from 12 million to 7.2 million, so it's a decrease in funding under the bill. It also, as I understand it, does not incorporate the provisions of LB 525. It is intended to have both issues dealt with individually, but they would then mesh together as a result of the adjustment Senator Lynch is proposing. So I guess I would still say I support the amendment. It does reduce down the funding level from 12 to 7.2 million, but as a compatible situation with what is going on LB 525, again the providers end up coming out quite